

## REMARKS

By the foregoing amendments claim 6 has been cancelled and the limitations thereof have been added to independent claim 1. Thus, with entry of these amendments claims 1-5 remain in the application.

Claims 1-5 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (JP 2002-052659 A) in view of Kageyama (JP 2002-307506 A). The references were cited for the reasons and in the manner set forth on pages 2-5 of the Office Action.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Kageyama, and further in view of Hamaguchi (JP 2003-192061 A) as stated on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action.

These rejections are hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks set forth below.

It is respectfully submitted that the improved process for preparing a multilayer structure product of the present invention as recited in claims 1-5 as amended is not rendered obvious, 35 U.S.C. § 103, by the combination of Hayashi, et al., Kageyama, et al., and Hamaguchi, et al. The primary reference to Hayashi, et al. describes a process for melt-molding EVOH but there are no disclosures in the reference of Applicants claimed process involving holding the temperature of the melt-molding machine as recited in claims 1-5 as amended.

The secondary reference to Kageyama, et al. only describes adjusting the heat-retention temperature, but there are no specific disclosures using



EVOH as moldable resin. There are no disclosures of holding the temperature of the molding machine as in the present invention. Further, in Kageyama, et al. there are no disclosures of direct-blow molding.

In respect to Hamaguchi, et al., multi-layer blow molding is only described as Description of the Related Art. Although Hamaguchi, et al. relates to a “multi-layer hollow container and method of producing it”, a method for blow-molding itself is nothing but the assumption of the invention of Hamaguchi, et al.

A heat degraded article such as a gel of EVOH or a decomposed object is grown up when the molding machine ceases operation. The degraded article does not become a serious problem when manufacturing a thick molded article obtained by injection molding. Therefore, it does not become a serious problem when the molding machine is left to stand inoperative. See paragraph [0085] of the English translation of Hayashi, et al. concerning the requirements for a certain amount of thickness for injection molding.

However, the present invention as recited in the claims as amended is applied for direct-blow molding to manufacture a molded article having a thickness which is relatively thinner than a molded article manufactured by injection molding. Therefore, the existence of a heat degraded article, even where its size is small, becomes a serious problem when the molding machine is left to stand inoperative.

Therefore, a person skilled in the art would not be lead to combine the method of Kageyama, et al. which concerns injection molding, to direct-blow




molding as in the present invention because there is no necessity to remove a heat degraded article.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 512.46131X00) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald J. Shore/   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald J. Shore  
Registration No. 28,577  
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

RJS/kmh